Religion and ethnicity at work: a study of British Muslim women's labour market performance

Abstract

The literature on British Muslim women's labour market experience suffers from four lacunae: the inadequate analysis of the multi-layered facets of their identities and the disadvantages they face; the narrow range of labour market outcomes studied (primarily labour market participation and unemployment); a lack of recent studies on the integration of Muslim women, educated in the UK and with English as their first language, into the labour market; and the absence of material on several sub-groups due to the lack of data, notably Arab, Christian Indian and White-British Muslim women. Using a large sample of data from the 2011 British census, the analyses presented here suggest that most Non-White women face significant labour market penalties, with religion having a greater impact on labour market outcomes than race/ethnicity; Muslim women were the most disadvantaged, compared to other religious minorities, more so in relation to unemployment levels, part-time jobs and out of employment history, than in relation to occupational class and over-qualification. The results also suggest that the penalties facing Muslim women shaped by their ethnicity; not all Muslim women were similarly disadvantaged.

Keywords: Muslim women, UK labour market, ethnic penalty, religious penalty, employment prospects

Introduction

The literature on Muslim women's experience in the British labour market suffers from four major shortcomings. First, it fails to recognise adequately the intersectional effects of the multi-layered facets that Muslim women have to deal with in their lives, such as their ethnicity/race, religion, gender, migration history, and class. Second, most previous research has focused primarily on just two aspects of labour market experience – participation and unemployment (Brah 1993, Dale et al. 2002a, Dale, Lindley and Dex 2006) – whilst neglecting other important outcomes such as incomes, whether working part-time or full-time, whether occupations match their qualifications, and whether they obtain jobs in the salariat (the higher status professional and managerial occupations).

Third, since Dale and her colleagues published their studies of Muslim (mainly Pakistani and Bangladeshi) women over a decade ago (Dale 2002, Dale et al. 2002a, Dale et al. 2002b), this topic has been largely neglected despite the steady growth in Muslim women's academic achievement (Ahmad 2001) and the substantial growth in the number of second-generation Muslim women who have entered UK higher education institutions. Finally, most studies have focused on just three ethnic minority groups: Pakistanis, Bangladeshis and Indians (Dale and Ahmed 2011). Although these constitute about 60 per cent of all UK Muslims, very little is known about the experience of the remaining 40 per cent, especially Arabs (7 per cent; these are identified in the 2011 UK census), Black-Africans (8 per cent) or even Whites (who also comprise 8 per cent of all Muslim women).

These lacunae leave us with many important unanswered questions, such as: 'How has the labour market integration of British Muslim women changed more recently?'; 'How do Muslim women fare in the labour market compared to both White majority and other Non-White minority women?'; 'Do all Muslim women face similar labour market penalties regardless of ethnicity, education and migration history?'; 'To what extent has increased Muslim women's academic achievements improved their labour market integration?'; and 'How likely are Muslim women to find jobs commensurate with their qualifications?'.

This paper addresses those questions using a large microdata sample (5 per cent of the total population) from the 2011 UK Census, which allows analysis of ethnic and religious groups that have not been previously identified, such as Muslim-Arabs, Christian-Arabs, Christian-Indians and Muslim White-British – whose numbers have been too small to include in analyses using other data sets. In addition, the census data include variables regarding human capital not available in either previous census data or the Labour Force Survey, such as language proficiency and length of stay for those born outside the UK. Finally, the analyses here also cover labour market outcomes omitted from most previous research, including occupational attainment with a focus on whether Muslim women obtain jobs commensurate with their qualifications, including in the salariat; they also investigate patterns of out-of-employment history additionally to whether individuals are unemployed at a single census date only.

While some labour market behaviours among women (e.g. being economically inactive or work part-time) are likely to be affected by individual and family choices and preferences (Boeckmann, Misra and Budig 2014, Crompton and Harris 1998), other labour market outcomes, and surely those that we are analysing here are primarily determined by labour market opportunities and employers' tastes and practices (Darity and Mason 1998, Ridgeway 1997). Theoretically, this paper draws on the literature of social exclusion in workplaces and

employment discrimination (Andriessen et al. 2012, Byron 2010, Reskin, McBrier and Kmec 1999), on notions of cultural and physical boundaries and racialisation (Connor and Koenig 2015, Meer and Modood 2009, Rana 2007) and the theory of intersectionality (Brah and Phoenix 2013, McBride, Hebson and Holgate 2015) in seeking explanations for Muslim women's experience in the British labour market. It argues that minority women's experience in general, and Muslim women's more specifically, is primarily shaped by discriminatory practices in hiring and promotion resulting from the concurrent intersections of ethnicity/race, religion and migration. The influence of each intersect is exacerbated or deflated based on its interaction with the other characteristics.

Intersectionality, discrimination and labour market outputs

British Muslim women's labour market experience cannot be understood solely through the traditional gender framework or even the human capital paradigm . They are not just women competing with men for jobs, because their human capital is not assessed by employers similarly to that of White women. Additionally to their gender, they see themselves, and are seen by others, as bearing further, no less significant, identities, most notably their faith and/or cultural background, their ethnicity, and their migration status. A number of studies have pointed out that such identities or categories of race/ethnicity, migration and religion form the criteria or rationale according to which employers assess the suitability and cost of potential employees (Andriessen et al. 2012, Budhwar et al. 2010, Byron 2010, Kalter and Kogan 2006, Reskin, McBrier and Kmec 1999). In what follows we discuss the ways and extent in which these categories can trigger employment discrimination.

Visibility matters – the impact of structural intersectionality

Muslim women in Britain, or at least a large proportion of them, face two visibility layers additional to their gender; racial-biological (skin colour) and cultural. These are extremely important in shaping their life experiences and labour market participation, especially with the current increase of Islamophobia (Gottschalk and Greenberg 2008), with racializing Muslims an outcome of the war on terror launched after 9/11 (Meer and Modood 2009, Rana 2007).

The impact of skin colour

Similarly to Black women in the US and the UK (Brah and Phoenix 2013, Hooks 1981), Non-White British Muslim women (Black and other dark-skinned women), including those in the middle class, face labour market barriers and potential bias not experienced by White women. Many employers use racial, gender and other ascriptive criteria as part of their hiring practices (Allen 2005, Andriessen et al. 2012, Budhwar et al. 2010, Maxwell 2009, Neckerman and Kirschenman 1991). However, the motivation for using such ascriptive criteria varies from one employer to another. For example, some employers prefer to hire workers from certain ethnic, racial or religious groups, while holding negative preferences towards individuals from other groups (Becker 1957, Byron 2010). Other employers, probably lacking sufficient relevant information to assess potential workers' future productivity, tend to practice statistical discrimination (treating all individuals as members of a pre-defined category: Phelps 1972), which leads them to deny employment opportunities to members of certain racial, ethnic and gender groups because of perceived lower productivity levels of these groups. So, dark skin colour, affiliation to different faith backgrounds and gender is very often used by employers to place potential workers at the back of the queue to

enter the labour market, whereas individuals with preferred ascriptive backgrounds are placed towards the front of the queue (Reskin 2001). A number of UK studies have identified both colour racism and/or racial discrimination against Non-White groups (Blackaby et al. 2005, Heath, Cheung and Britain 2006, Maxwell 2009, Modood 2005), which implies that Non-White women are likely to face structural barriers in the labour market. Dustmann et al. (2003), for example, have pointed out that on average Non-White women have lower labour market participation rates and face a greater risk of unemployment, and among these groups, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Black-African women are the most vulnerable (Dale 2002, Dale et al. 2002a).

Cultural visibility and the effect of names

Any disadvantages experienced by Non-White Muslim women may also be linked to their cultural visibility, especially for those leading their lives in line with Islamic *Sharia* laws. Many, including large numbers who do not ascribe to Sharia laws, wear the *hijab* (the Muslim headscarf) and/or adopt other cultural markers which accentuate their visible differences as Non-White women (suchas wearing the chador, niqab or burkha). Their cultural differences (including their religious backgrounds), on the one hand, and their physical appearance, on the other, are likely to invoke both colour and cultural racism (Modood 2005). In most cases it will be difficult to disentangle their separate effects, but Muslim White-British women provide a unique example where colour racism, at least in theory, is irrelevant. On the one hand they can claim membership in the advantaged group of White-British, while still adopting other identities, such as being a woman and a Muslim on the other hand. So does the effect of claiming membership of the dominant ethnic category cancel out any potential negative effects of belonging to other less favoured categories? Some recent studies of East European migrants suggest not, but very much depends on the local historical context (Fox, Moroşanu and Szilassy 2012, Fox 2013). For example, Fox et al. (2012), focusing on Hungarians and Romanians, have analysed how current East European migration has been racialized in both the UK's immigration policy and tabloid journalism. Although both groups are White and European, Romanians have been racialized differently (mainly by tabloid media) in a way that disregards their Whiteness as a shared basis for inclusion. Instead, their cultural difference has been highlighted as a basis for exclusion.

While most employers will not know the ethnic, racial or even religious background of an applicant until a face-to-face interview is conducted, and in some cases much later than that, they nevertheless get to see the applicant's name as soon as the application or CV is submitted. This may be the most critical stage at which discrimination in hiring takes place. A number of studies examining the effect of names among minorities and migrants on chances of hiring and job offers using field experiment approaches have found strong evidence of discrimination based on names (Andriessen et al. 2012, Bertrand and Mullainathan 2004, Blommaert, Coenders and Van Tubergen 2014, Budhwar et al. 2010). For example, Andriessen et al. (2012) carried out a field experiment in The Netherlands examining the tendency amongst employers to discriminate against names that signalling immigrant descent. They found strong evidence that discrimination remains a problem in selection procedures there. Likewise, Blommaert et al. (2014) found very strong evidence for discrimination against Arabic-named applicants. Given that most minority and migrant women in the UK are likely to have names other than traditional British ones, it is likely that employers will be more relectant to offer them a job interview than in the case of British-named applicants. Almost all Muslim women in the UK have distinctive Muslim and Arab names such as Aysha, Asma, Mariam, Samina, Fouzia, and so on, which are easily identified

by native employers as belonging to minority women. Therefore, we anticipate that their unemployment level will be significantly higher than their native counterparts.

Names, similarly to racial, ethnic and religion traits, would trigger a range of positive or negative responses among employers depending on their stereotypes of the groups to which they believe the applicant belongs. According to Andriessen et al. (2012), when stereotypes are used by employers to match candidates to jobs, discrimination might be the outcome (p, 241). This implies that many potential candidates will be handicapped in competing for jobs due to having names that do not sound native enough; such candidates are likely to be weak contenders in any queue for jobs containing members of the majority population, as well as some other minority groups. The literature suggests that this is likely to happen when employers estimate the expected future productivity of an individual using their stereotypes and perceptions of the group to which they believe this individual belongs (Pager and Karafin 2009).

Micro processes and labour market performance

'Origins, destinations and communities' are important constituents of ethnic minority individuals' identities (Van Tubergen, Maas and Flap 2004). Both first- and second-generation ethnic minority group members apparently suffer a combined ethnic labour market penalty, but the second generation have begun to bridge the gap in terms of their performance relative to their first generation counterparts (Algan et al. 2010, Dale et al. 2002a). A number of studies have suggested that labour market disadvantages are likely to be temporary, resulting from initial lack of language skills, knowledge and familiarity with the system of the new host country, especially in relation to how the labour markets operate (for example see Borjas 1994, Chiswick 1978, Chiswick 1999, Chiswick and Miller 2002). Of these potential factors the most important is apparently the devaluation of skills and qualifications that were obtained in the source countries (Lerner and Menahem 2003, Nielsen 2011).

Secondary analysis of a 1994 survey, bolstered by qualitative interviews, indicated that both lack of English and possession of overseas qualifications hindered Pakistani and Bangladeshi women's labour market progress (Dale et al. 2002a, Dale et al. 2002b). Among second generation women, a UK education and the opportunity for work and paid-employment as a mean of self-fulfilment are cited as contributory factors in their rising labour market profiles. Therefore, the length of stay since arriving in the host country and the level of language proficiency become important factors in affecting the labour market integration of migrants and minorities.

Qualifications and skills also play an important role in determining labour market participation amongst minority-group women (Bhopal 1998, Salway 2007). Qualifications provide better access to the labour market (see Spierings, Smits and Verloo 2010 for the case of women in Muslim countries), improve women's negotiating positions regarding after-marriage economic activity (Dale et al. 2002b) and reduce unemployment penalties (on the role of socio-cultural assimilation as an influence on European Muslim women's labour market experiences see also Koopmans 2016). Muslim women, especially those planning to become economically active after leaving school, understand that they are more likely to face labour market penalties due to widespread stereotypes and racism, perhaps more so than

Muslim men (Tyrer and Ahmad 2006). They believe that the only viable route to a good job and the only way they can tackle the anticipated labour market discrimination is by obtaining higher educational qualifications and become not only as good as majority group, but better (Dale et al. 2002b).

Other important factors affecting the labour market participation of Muslim women in particular are marriage patterns and customs – including the expectations of male partners (Bhopal 1998, Peach 2006a). For example, a number of studies found that unmarried and well-qualified Pakistani women in the UK have employment rates as high as White women (Dale, Lindley and Dex 2006, Lindley, Dale and Dex 2004). There is also some evidence that Muslim women who marry a partner from the sending regions of Bangladesh and Pakistan are disadvantaged in the labour market because of the cultural norms expressed by their male partners, compared to Muslim women with higher educational levels who are less likely to marry an overseas partner (Dale and Ahmed 2011); the latter group's economic participation rates are as high as White groups.

A number of studies focussing on the geographical profile of Muslims in the UK have found a relatively high concentration of Muslims in particular places, including areas with high socioeconomic deprivation such as Tower Hamlets in Greater London (Peach 2005, Peach 2006b). Although their concentration level is no where near ghetto-like segregation (Johnston, Manley and Jones 2016), many studies have found strong correlations between segregation and labour market outcomes (Fieldhouse 1999, Fieldhouse and Tranmer 2001, Kain 1968, Tomaskovic-Devey et al. 2006). For example, Peach (2006) has pointed out that about 70 per cent of the Muslim population of England and Wales is highly concentrated in four urban agglomerations: London, and the West Midland, Greater Manchester and West Yorkshire Metropolitan Counties. Because employment opportunities and growth substantially differ across the UK different regions (Fingleton, Garretsen and Martin 2012), and given the geographical concentration of the Muslim population, it is very important to take this issue into account when analysing the labour market performance of Muslim women in the UK.

The very few studies on the labour market participation of Muslim women in the UK identify changing trends in the economic profiles of British Muslim women, in particular because of improving education qualifications among the increasing numbers of second and third generation Muslim women born and raisea in the UK, and with English as their first language. Some significant differences in their employment outcomes remain, however, given their human capital and individual circumstances, a gap which it is argued is a function of employment discrimination (Lindley, Dale and Dex 2006) although there is also evidence suggesting that the low labour market participation among Muslim women can be attributed to cultural traditions and religion (Spierings 2014). The full picture cannot be understood without taking into account the multiple intersections of ethnicity, religion and migration within which life experiences are shaped – which is this paper's goal.

Hypotheses

In light of the above discussion, we examine the following hypotheses:

Any penalties facing Non-White women will be larger than those experienced by the majority White women.

Muslim women are likely to face greater disadvantages than other non-White women in the UK due to discrimination on the grounds of both colour and cultural racism.

White-British Muslim women are likely to face lower levels of discrimination in the labour market, primarily because of their whiteness, language fluency and familiarity with the local system.

Muslim women without degrees and with shorter periods of residency in the UK are likely to face greater levels of labour market disadvantages than Muslim women with degrees and longer periods of residency in the UK.

Methods and data

The analyses reported here explore whether, and to what extent, Muslim women are disadvantaged in the British labour market. The data are taken from the 2011 Census Microdata Individual Safeguarded Sample (Regional). This sample is 5% of the total population stratified at the region level (2,848,155 observations). The final analytical sample includes 506,065 respondents, which guarantees sufficient cases for analysing sub-groups that have not been studied previously such as Muslim-Arabs and Christian-Indians. The data cover a wide range of topics including personal information, labour market and employment details, qualifications, language used at home, length of stay since migration, ethnic and religious background and many more. The large sample size and rich information make these data ideal for studying ethnic and religious differences in the labour market.

Labour market disadvantage is represented here in five ways:

- Unemployed – whether the respondent was unemployed at the time of the census (coded 1 for those in the labour force who were unemployed and 0 otherwise);
- Out of employment history – for those who reported that they were currently unemployed, the length of time since they had last held a job, grouped into: up to one year; two to five years; six to eleven years; and had never held a job.
- Part-time employees – for those who were in the labour force and were not unemployed (coded 1 if in a part-time job and 0 otherwise);
- Match between qualifications and occupation – this compares the respondent's highest educational qualification with the modal qualifications for all individuals in each occupation, with the relationship between the two classified as: match, where the respondent's highest qualification matched the mode for her occupation; underqualified, where the respondent's highest qualification was less than the mode for her occupation (either severely or moderately); and overqualified, where the respondent's highest qualification[i] was higher than the mode for her occupation (either severely or moderately) (Chevalier 2003, Groot and Van Den Brink 2000); and
- Occupation – the respondent's stated occupation in two categories: higher/lower managerial and professional (often termed the salariat); and all of the rest including intermediate White-collar occupations plus small employers and those in lower supervisory plus routine and semi-routine (often termed 'blue collar') occupations.

The expectations are that if certain groups – particularly Non-White Muslim women – are disadvantaged in labour market operations they should be: more likely to be unemployed than the comparator group (White British women); of those unemployed, more likely to suffer longer periods out of work; of those employed, more likely to be able to find only part-time

rather than full-time work (while accepting that for some part-time work is chosen for personal and/or household and family reasons); more likely to have jobs for which they are over-qualified; and less likely to have salariat jobs – in all, cases holding constant personal characteristics, as discussed below.

The analyses of each of these disadvantage measures is undertaken for fifteen major ethno-religious categories:

- Christian – divided into White-British, White-Irish, Indian, Black African, Black Caribbean, and Arab;
- Hindu and Sikh Indians;
- Muslims – divided into White-British, Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Black African, and Arab;
- No Religion White British.

Other groups, most of them relatively small, identified in the census (such as Jewish) are excluded from the analyses, as are those who reported mixed ethnic identities.

In exploring differences among those fifteen groups on the five disadvantage measures, several control variables were introduced to reflect respondents' human capital and household/family situations.

- Family structure – divided into those with one, two, or three or more dependent children aged under 10, those with dependent children but none of them aged under 10, and those with no dependent children;
- Marital status – divided into those who were single, divorced/separated, and married (the latter included living in an established partnership);
- The length of time since they migrated to Britain – divided into those who were UK born, those resident there less than 5, 5-10, and 11 or more years;
- Region of residence – contrasting London with the North, Midland, East and South regions of England, and Wales;[1]
- Proficiency in English – whether it was their first language or not;
- Age; and
- Highest qualifications – grouped into those with no qualifications and in the four levels into which UK qualifications are generally divided.

Findings

Descriptive analysis

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics on the disadvantage measures for the fifteen ethno-religious groups (the two last columns in the table and in the following table compare between all Muslims and all Christians in two collective groups). In terms of the proportion in the labour market but unemployed at the time of the census, there is a clear difference between the Muslim groups and most of the others; only Christian Black African women had a rate exceeding that of some of the Muslims (though within the Black African community, unemployment was more than twice as high among Muslims as Christians). Christian White-British, White-Irish, and Hindu-Indians had the lowest rates, along with Sikh Indians. In

[1] Separate censuses were conducted in Scotland and Northern Ireland, and those parts of the UK are excluded from this study.

general, too, many more Muslim women had never worked, compared to Christians. Muslims were also more likely to be in part-time employment than all Christian groups; over half of all Muslim Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi worked part-time. Muslim women were also more likely than Christian women to be in occupations for which they were over-qualified and there were fewer of them (except for Muslim-Arabs) in the salariat occupations than their Christian counterparts.

Table 1 about here

Table 2 presents the situation across the 15 ethno-religious groups on the control variables (here too the last two columns in the table represent all Muslims and all Christians as two collective groups). More Muslim women had dependent children than their Christian White counterparts, and conversely many more had three or more dependent young children; more of them, too, were single and fewer were either divorced or separated. Not surprisingly, many fewer were born in the UK than among Christian White-British women, but most of Muslim women had been in the country for more than four years. Muslims – excepting those of Pakistani origin – and those of Black ethnicity were much more concentrated in London than the White-British, and fewer of them than in any of the Christian groups gave English as their first language. Muslim women were also on average much younger.

Table 2 about here

Multivariate analysis

This descriptive overview gives a clear picture suggesting that Muslim women are more likely than members of other ethno-religious groups to be disadvantaged in the labour market. But was this simply because of differences between them and the other groups – notably the majority Christian White-British women – in their human capital and family situations? When the latter are taken into account, does that apparent pattern of disadvantage disappear, or is there still evidence of Muslim women underperforming – and, by implication, suffering from disadvantages/penalties reflecting their cultural backgrounds?

To evaluate whether Muslim women experienced labour market penalties relative to members of the Christian White British majority group, logit models were deployed. Where the dependent variable was a simple binomial classification (whether unemployed as against employed; whether part-time rather than full-time; and whether in salariat as against other job types), binary models were fitted; for the variable with several ordered categories (out of employment history), order logit models were deployed; and for multinomial classifications (the match between educational and occupational qualifications) multinomial logits were fitted. The results are in Table 3.

Unemployment. The relationships with the control variables show that those with large families were more likely to be unemployed than those with only one young dependent and even more so than those without either young or any dependent children; married people were more likely to be unemployed than those who were single. Unemployment was also significantly lower, the longer individual women had been resident in the UK, among those for whom English was the first language, among the better qualified, and among older women up to a particular age (the negative coefficient for age and the positive one for age-squared). Unemployment was also much lower in London than elsewhere.

Given these relationships with human capital – all in the anticipated direction – the block of coefficients for the fourteen ethno-religious groups being compared with the situation for Christian White British women are, with one exception, both positive and highly significant statistically. Of the seven largest coefficients – all 0.70 or greater – six are for the Muslim groups (the seventh is for Christian Black-Africans). Among Muslim women, those of Arab, Black-African, Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnicity were both substantially and statistically significantly more likely to be unemployed than either Muslim White-British and Muslim Indians.[2]

Part-time employment. Women with large numbers of dependent young children were more likely, as anticipated, to be in part-time rather than full-time employment, as were married women compared to those who were single. Women with dependent children need additional time and flexibility primarily to caring for and nurturing their dependent children while they continue working outside the home (Jeffrey Hill, Märtinson and Ferris 2004). Those with no qualifications were also more likely to be in part- rather than full-time employment than those with higher qualifications. Part-time employment declined with age, and with length of time resident in the UK; it was also less likely to be the case for women whose first language was English; and fewer were employed part-time in London than elsewhere.

Holding those differences constant, once again Muslim women appeared to suffer greater penalties than their counterparts – not only the Christian White British but also several of the other ethno-religious groups (a number of which had significantly lower part-time employment rates than the comparator group, e.g. Christian-Irish and Christian-Indians). There were major differences among the Muslim groups, however. On average, on both levels of unemployment and rates of out of employment, Muslim White-British women were less disadvantaged than members of the other Muslim groups. For part-time working there was no significant difference between either Muslim White British or Muslim-Arabs and the Christian White British, suggesting again that 'White' Muslims – or at least those with 'less dark skins' – are less likely to be disadvantaged in the labour market than those with a colour as well as a religious identity and visibility; Indian, Pakistani, and Bangladeshi women were significantly more likely to be working only part-time. Among Muslim women, Indians have the highest odds-ratio of working part time; given that they also experience the lowest penalty in unemployment, this suggests that they have strong desire to work.

Occupational class. Holding constant their educational qualifications, women with large numbers of dependent young children were less likely to be in the salariat class rather than the other lower classes with a very significant difference between having one dependent child under 10 and having no dependent children at all. Having any dependent children appears to be strongly associated with substantial employment penalties for women. Likewise, being single rather than married or divorced/separated is associated with lower likelihood of being in a lower class occupation rather than in the salariat.

[2] Whether one regression coefficient is significantly different from another can be evaluated using the 2SE test – for each coefficient calculate the range of values within +/- 2SE of the estimated value, and inquire whether the two value-spans overlap. If they do not – as with the coefficients for Muslim Arab and Muslim Black African, on the one hand, and for Muslim White-British and Indian, on the other, then the differences are statistically significant. Muslim-Arabs and Black-Africans were significantly more likely to be unemployed than Muslim-Indians and White-British.

As expected, the longer women have spent in the UK, the greater the likelihood of having a salariat job, as was also the case for those having English as their main language. Those with no qualifications were more likely to be in lower occupational classes than those with higher levels, particularly those with a degree.

Three separate types can be identified from the coefficients for the ethno-religious groups; those who are more advantaged than Christian White-British; those who are as advantaged; and those who are less advantaged. Christian White-Irish, Christian-Indians and No Religion White-British fall within the first category; Muslim-Arab women along with Christian Black-Caribbean women occupy the second type (at least in statistical terms); and the remaining groups, including the other five Muslim groups, comprise the less advantaged. Christian Arab and Black-African women experience the highest penalties (log-odds of -0.51, -0.29 and -0.32 for Christian Arab and Black-African women and Muslim Black-African women respectively), but not Christian Black-Caribbean women as well.

Table 3 about here

Out of employment history. A very similar pattern of relationships for the human capital variables is also shown for length of unemployment. The five largest positive – all statistically significant – coefficients among the ethno-religious groups are all for Muslim women. Holding constant their personal characteristics, being a Muslim woman extends the average duration of unemployment for those out of work and seeking positions; it increases the likelihood of a longer period of unemployment up to a situation of total economic inactivity (the category of never worked) than both the country's majority group and most of the other ethno-religious groups. Christian-Indians experienced a penalty greater than Muslim Indians, but the other two Indian groups experienced no penalty in their length of unemployment relative to majority group.

The match between qualifications and occupation. The greatest penalty on this variable concerns those who are seriously over-qualified – i.e. are in occupations for which they have qualifications two levels or more above those which are the norm for those jobs. Those with large numbers of dependent young children are more likely to be seriously over-qualified, presumably indicating that their need for employment and income makes many such women take whatever jobs are available. This was also the case with those who have been in the UK for the shortest time, for those whose main language was not English, for younger people, and for those living outside London. (Because of collinearity problems, the qualifications variable was not included in this regression.)

Given those overall patterns related to human capital, the coefficients for the ethno-religious groups again indicate that most Muslim women suffered labour market penalties compared to Christian White British women – although, again, Muslim White women are excluded from that conclusion as their rate is not significantly different from that for the comparator group. But in this case Christian Arab, Hindu and Sikh Indian women were as likely to experience such disadvantages as their Muslim counterparts.[3]

[3] An additional finding is that some of the Muslim groups had significant positive coefficients for being in posts for which they were severely under-qualified – i.e. lacked the qualifications that were the norm for such jobs. This probably reflects that they were being employed within a minority ethnic enclave labour market, where social/family networks were more important than qualifications in the allocation of employment.

The findings generalised

The findings discussed above provide very strong evidence that Muslim women are substantially and significantly disadvantaged in the British labour market, and that it is their religion rather than their ethnicity which underpins these penalties. To confirm this conclusion, the regressions reported in Table 3 were re-run, but with the 15 ethno-religious categories replaced, first, by the eight main ethnic categories generally deployed by the Office of National Statistics (those with mixed identity were excluded from all of the analyses) and, second, by five main religious groups. All of the other variables were included in the regressions, but the coefficients are excluded from Table 4, which presents those for the Ethnicity and Religious variables only.

The coefficients in the first block of Table 4 (together with their associated standard errors and significance levels) show very clearly that Bangladeshi, Pakistani and Black-African[4] women suffered the greatest employment penalties compared to their White British counterparts. Those in the second block show that Muslims experienced the greatest disadvantages compared to Christians – except that Hindus and Sikh were more likely to be seriously over-qualified. For unemployment, out of employment history, and part-time rather than full-time working, the coefficients for Muslims (in the lower block) were larger than those for women from the two main sources of Muslim immigrants (Bangladesh and Pakistan: in the upper block). However, the fact that Hindus and Sikhs experience a greater penalty in over-qualification, but less in relation to unemployment, suggests that they might be more employable than Muslim women, but are likely to be offered and accept jobs below the level for which they are qualified.

Both religion and colour/ethnicity generate labour market penalties for British women, therefore, with religion having the greater influence of the two. But such a general conclusion expunges the differences within religious groups – especially among Muslims – shown in Table 3. Among Muslim women, those with Bangladeshi and Pakistani identity were much more likely to be disadvantaged than White British Muslims, and among Black-Africans Muslims suffered more than Christians.

Human capital variations among Muslims

Are Muslim women's labour market experiences affected by their human capital, especially their qualifications, whether English is their main language, and their length of stay in the UK? To examine these issues, the regressions in Table 3 were re-run for Muslim women only, but with additional interaction terms examining: first, whether having a degree interacted with English as a main language would yield better employment outcomes; and, second, whether a degree interacted with length of residency in the UK has an impact beyond the general impact of a degree. As with Table 4, all of the other variables were included in the regressions, but the coefficients are excluded from Table 5, which contains only those for the interaction terms and the main effect.

The top part of the table shows the main effects of length of residency, English as the main language and having a degree. In general, the impacts are in the same direction and mostly

[4] Many Black Africans are Muslims; most Black Caribbeans are Christians.

significant as in Table 3, but are generally much weaker. This suggests a reduced value of these variables in tackling labour market penalties among Muslim women once the interactions are taken into account. All of the interaction terms for having a degree and English as the main language are insignificant, however. Those with a degree who have been in the UK for more than 11 years are less likely to have been unemployed, so long-term resident Muslim women with degrees and speaking English were less likely to be unemployed than more recent arrivals, those not speaking English, and those without degrees – and those long-established and with degrees were even less likely.

These results uncover an interesting mechanism underpinning some of the penalties facing Muslim women in the UK. It can be labelled as "skimmed human capital", in that their labour market disadvantages are significantly associated with their inability to utilise their human capital resources, holding all other variables constant, to equalise their gains with the majority group.

Discussion

This study has analysed the performance of Muslim women in the British labour market using large-sample data from the 2011 UK Census and addressing four lacunae in the literature on ethnic employment penalties. We argued that minority women's labour market experience is primarily shaped by the parallel intersections of ethnicity/race, religion and their migration history and that the ways in which these intersect should account for why some groups face greater penalties than others. The main mechanism through which these intersections operate is discrimination practiced by employers and contributing to the exclusion of non-White and particularly Muslim women in the labour market.

The results of this study show that most Non-White women (excepting Christian-Indian women) face significant labour market penalties, confirming the first hypothesis. These are not particularly harsh for Black women generally – only in relation to occupation classes do Black-Africans (Muslims and Christians alike) experience the highest penalty, contrary to the results of previous studies (e.g. Dustmann et al. 2013). Overall, religion had a greater impact on labour market outcomes than race/ethnicity. Of the different religions, Muslim women were the most disadvantaged in relation to unemployment, part-time jobs and out of employment history. Compared to other minority religions, they were less disadvantaged in relation to occupational class and over-qualification. This can be attributed to cultural norms and codes that dictate the kind of jobs that women can do within the wider labour market, but may not apply in localised, ethnic enclave economies, which normally involve non-manual and professional jobs. If suitable jobs are not available – whether in the wider or the localised labour market – women from some cultures are under less pressure to work as their partners (when married) are expected to support them.

As anticipated, both the descriptive data and the regressions holding constant individuals' store of human capital showed that in general Muslim women experienced the severest penalties – across a range of five separate indices of disadvantage – but that there were variations across the several Muslim groups: in general, those with separate racial as well as cultural characteristics – notably Bangladeshi, Pakistani and Black-African Muslim women (21 per cent of the latter were Muslims) – suffered the greatest penalties. These results lend support to our second hypothesis. They also support some recent studies about the distinctive

'Muslim penalty' that many face in the UK, most likely due to increasing Islamophobia and discrimination (Heath and Martin 2013).

Several of the ethno-religious groups analysed allow interesting comparisons that illuminate the separate roles of ethnicity and religion as influences on labour market operations. Both Muslim White-British and Christian-Indian women can claim membership within the advantaged majority group. The former belong to the dominant ethnic category (White-British), whereas the latter belong to the dominant religious category (Christianity). On the other hand, they also belong to disadvantaged groups (being either a Muslim or a Non-White). Controlling for their individual differences and human capital resources, being a Muslim appeared to suppress the advantages associated with being White whereas, conversely, belonging to a Non-White group only increased some of the penalties (being unemployed and length of unemployment) for Christian-Indians; performance of the latter on the other labour market outcomes exceeds that of the other three Indian groups (Hindu, Sikh and Muslims) – and indeed that of the majority Christian White-British. This surprising finding challenges the assertion made by some previous studies that dark colour is a frequent source of disadvantage (Brah and Phoenix 2013, Crenshaw 1991, Hooks 1981); the negative impact of dark skin can apparently be cancelled if it intersects with other categories considered 'superior' by the dominant group. Furthermore, this finding confirms the conclusions reached by Model and Lin (2002) that there is a penalty associated with being non-Christian, as do the significant penalties experienced by No Religion White-British group compared to the Christian White-British. What matters is possibly not skin colour per se but the perceived culture – as argued by Fox et al. (2012) in relation to Romanian migrants in the UK and other studies linking Whiteness and class (Archer and Francis 2006, Arrighi 2001, Reay et al. 2007). Furthermore, it is possible that those women who subscribed to the Christian category attend churches and services more often than others, which provides them with more diversed social networks that can help them find better employment opportunities.

Compared with the other Muslim groups, White-British Muslim women experience lower penalties than most of the other Muslim groups in unemployment, but most notably in relation to part-time jobs and over-qualification. Any penalties they face, when compared to the majority group, probably reflect discrimination on religious grounds plus racism (Franks 2000, Moosavi 2015), but their relative advantage over the other Muslim groups can be attributed to their familiarity with British culture, their social capital within the majority group (parents and friends) and not least their fluency with the English language. This finding, which confirms our third hypothesis, suggests that discrimination is not absolute and that employers respond differently to the intersection of racial, ethnic and religious identities. It is possible that employers associate a higher level of productivity with Muslim White-British women than with other Muslim women, especially if they are Blacks, Pakistanis or Bangladeshis. It is also possible that some White-British converts have not changed their names after converting to Islam, making them less identifiable as 'others', and as such they are likely to get through the first filtering stage of names, supporting some recent studies about the effect of names and job discrimination in hiring (Andriessen et al. 2012, Bertrand and Mullainathan 2004, Budhwar et al. 2010).

The penalties facing Muslim women reflect variations in their ethnicity. For example, Muslim-Arabs faced the greatest penalty in unemployment, but none in relation to occupational class. Muslim-Pakistani women face penalties in all of the five labour market outcomes examined in this study, whereas Muslim White-British women face none in two of the labour market outcomes and only a reduced penalty – compared to other Muslim groups –

in the other three. This confirms the argument that the influence of both ethnicity and religion is exacerbated or deflated based on its interaction with the other – sustaining the theory of intersectionality (Brah and Phoenix 2013, McBride, Hebson and Holgate 2015).

One other important finding is that among Muslim women penalties are lower for those for whom English is the main language, who have lived the longest in the UK and who have a degree; the longer they have lived in the country, the better their English and the higher their qualifications the greater the probability that their labour market experience will parallel that of the majority Christian White British population. This suggests that one of the main barriers facing Muslim women in the British labour market is their inability to utilise their human capital for socio-economic mobility and overcome labour market penalties. This finding supports our fourth hypothesis and provides a clear supports to the claimed deskilling of migrants and minorities (Chiswick 1978, Chiswick and Miller 2002). It is possible that the more time migrants spend in the host country, the more they are likely to improve their language skills but also to cumulate knowledge and skills on how to deal with unfair practices and employers' discrimination in the labour market.

Although discrimination and other types of structural barriers are pluasable explanations for the labour market performance of minority women in general and Muslim women more specifically, other explanations should also be considered, especially in relation to certain outcomes such as part-time employment, unemployment and nerver worked. For example, choices and prferences that are made by women on cultural grounds are also seen as possible explanations for women's labour market behaviour (Lehrer 2004). Many Muslim women would consider some jobs as inappropriate for them (those in male dominated environments or where modesty is compromised) or prefer jobs that do not conflict with their gender roles (Read 2004). These preferences are likely to be associated with a narrower range of employment opportunities leading to a higher risk of unemployment or longer spans of unemployment.

Conclusions

Muslim women are substantially disadvantaged within the British labour market, but the extent of their disadvantage varies not only according to their human capital and household-family situations but also by their ethnicity. Using a very large sample data set, the analyses reported here have explored those variations within the Muslim population as well as between various Muslim sub-groups and other substantial ethno-religious groups. The findings sustain the theory of intersectionality, particularly with regard to the importance of both colour and cultural racism. Likewise, the findings provide a strong evidence for the existence of both ethnic and religious discrimination in the British labour market. This discrimination seems to operate at all levels of selection/hiring process and beyond – for example in matching qualifications to jobs and obtaining managerial and professional occupations.

While we cannot be sure about the mechanisms through which this discrimination operates, it is quite possible that Muslim and other minority women are initially penalised when applying for jobs due to their names. It is also likely that many Muslim women whose dress conforms to religious expectations experience difficulties in the hiring process, especially at the interview stage. However, no information was available in the dataset about the religious

behaviour and practices and job preferences among women leaving many important questions without an answer. One of these questions is whether there is any difference in the labour market participation and outcomes between Muslim women wearing the *hijab* and those who don't. Another question is about whether Muslim women have job preferences and requirements on religious grounds contributing to narrowing their employment opportunities. Future studies and surveys on the participation of Muslim women in the labour market can significantly expand our knowledge in this regard by including questions on religious practices and job preferences.

Meantime, and given the evidence provided here and in other studies about the likelihood of discrimination being a real factor in shaping the labour market opportunities of women, and especially at stage of reviewing applications and CVs, policy makers and practitioners can tackle some of this discrimination by promoting nameless CVs and job applications. This could remove a very significant barrier preventing increased employment opportunities.

Bibliography

Ahmad, Fauzia. 2001. "Modern Traditions? British Muslim Women and Academic Achievement." *Gender and Education* 13(2):137-52.

Algan, Yann, Christian Dustmann, Albrecht Glitz and Alan Manning. 2010. "The Economic Situation of First and Second-Generation Immigrants in France, Germany and the United Kingdom*." *The Economic Journal* 120(542):F4-F30.

Allen, Chris. 2005. "From Race to Religion: The New Face of Discrimination." Pp. 49-65 in *Muslim Britain: Communities under Pressure*, edited by T. Abbas. London: Zed Books.

Andriessen, Iris, Eline Nievers, Jaco Dagevos and Laila Faulk. 2012. "Ethnic Discrimination in the Dutch Labor Market Its Relationship with Job Characteristics and Multiple Group Membership." *Work and occupations* 39(3):237-69.

Becker, Gary S. 1957. "The Economics of Discrimination." University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Bertrand, Marianne and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2004. "Are Emily and Greg More Employable Than Lakisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination." *The American Economic Review* 94(4):991-1013.

Bhopal, Kalwant. 1998. "How Gender and Ethnicity Intersect: The Significance of Education, Employment and Marital Status." *Sociological Research Online* 3(3):<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/3/3/6.html>.

Blackaby, DH, DG Leslie, Philip D Murphy and Nigel C O'Leary. 2005. "Born in Britain: How Are Native Ethnic Minorities Faring in the British Labour Market?". *Economics Letters* 88(3):370-75.

Blommaert, Lieselotte, Marcel Coenders and Frank Van Tubergen. 2014. "Discrimination of Arabic-Named Applicants in the Netherlands: An Internet-Based Field Experiment Examining Different Phases in Online Recruitment Procedures." *Social forces* 92(3):957-82.

Boeckmann, Irene, Joya Misra and Michelle J Budig. 2014. "Cultural and Institutional Factors Shaping Mothers' Employment and Working Hours in Postindustrial Countries." *Social forces*:sou119.

Brah, Avtar. 1993. "'Race'and 'Culture'in the Gendering of Labour Markets: South Asian Young Muslim Women and the Labour Market." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 19(3):441-58.

Brah, Avtar and Ann Phoenix. 2013. "Ain't Ia Woman? Revisiting Intersectionality." *Journal of International Women's Studies* 5(3):75-86.

Budhwar, Pawan S, Kamel Mellahi, Ingo Forstenlechner and Mohammed A Al-Waqfi. 2010. "'"A Job Interview for Mo, but None for Mohammed" Religious Discrimination against Immigrants in Austria and Germany." *Personnel Review* 39(6):767-84.

Byron, Reginald A. 2010. "Discrimination, Complexity, and the Public/Private Sector Question." *Work and occupations* 37(4):435-75.

Chevalier, Arnaud. 2003. "Measuring over-Education." *Economica* 70(279):509-31.

Chiswick, Barry R. 1978. "The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-Born Men." *The Journal of Political Economy* 86(5):897-921.

Chiswick, Barry R and Paul W Miller. 2002. "Immigrant Earnings: Language Skills, Linguistic Concentrations and the Business Cycle." *Journal of Population Economics* 15(1):31-57.

Connor, Phillip and Matthias Koenig. 2015. "Explaining the Muslim Employment Gap in Western Europe: Individual-Level Effects and Ethno-Religious Penalties." *Social science research* 49:191-201.

Crompton, Rosemary and Fiona Harris. 1998. "Explaining Women's Employment Patterns:'Orientations to Work'revisited." *British journal of Sociology*:118-36.
Dale, Angela. 2002. "Social Exclusion of Pakistani and Bangladeshi Women." *Sociological Research Online* <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/7/3/dale.html>(3).
Dale, Angela, Edward Fieldhouse, Nusrat Shaheen and Virinder Kalra. 2002a. "The Labour Market Prospects for Pakistani and Bangladeshi Women." *Work Employment & Society* 16(1):5-25.
Dale, Angela, Nusrat Shaheen, Virinder Kalra and Edward Fieldhouse. 2002b. "Routes into Education and Employment for Young Pakistani and Bangladeshi Women in the Uk." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25(6):942-68.
Dale, Angela, Joanne Lindley and Shirley Dex. 2006. "A Life-Course Perspective on Ethnic Differences in Women's Economic Activity in Britain." *European Sociological Review* 22(3):323-37.
Dale, Angela and Sameera Ahmed. 2011. "Marriage and Employment Patterns Amongst Uk-Raised Indian, Pakistani, and Bangladeshi Women." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34(6):902-24.
Darity, William A and Patrick L Mason. 1998. "Evidence on Discrimination in Employment: Codes of Color, Codes of Gender." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 12(2):63-90.
Dustmann, Christian, Francesca Fabbri, Ian Preston and Jonathan Wadsworth. 2003. *Labour Market Performance of Immigrants in the Uk Labour Market*: Home office.
Fieldhouse, Edward A. 1999. "Ethnic Minority Unemployment and Spatial Mismatch: The Case of London." *Urban Studies* 36(9):1569-96.
Fieldhouse, Edward A. and Mark Tranmer. 2001. "Concentration Effects, Spatial Mismatch, or Neighborhood Selection? Exploring Labour Market and Neighborhood Variations in Male Unemployment Risk Using Census Microdata from Great Britain." *Geographical Analysis* 33(4):353-69.
Fingleton, Bernard, Harry Garretsen and Ron Martin. 2012. "Recessionary Shocks and Regional Employment: Evidence on the Resilience of Uk Regions." *Journal of Regional Science* 52(1):109-33.
Fox, Jon E, Laura Moroşanu and Eszter Szilassy. 2012. "The Racialization of the New European Migration to the Uk." *Sociology*:0038038511425558.
Fox, Jon E. 2013. "The Uses of Racism: Whitewashing New Europeans in the Uk." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(11):1871-89.
Franks, Myfanwy. 2000. "Crossing the Borders of Whiteness? White Muslim Women Who Wear the Hijab in Britain Today." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 23(5):917-29.
Gottschalk, Peter and Gabriel Greenberg. 2008. *Islamophobia: Making Muslims the Enemy*: Rowman & Littlefield.
Groot, Wim and Henriette Maassen Van Den Brink. 2000. "Overeducation in the Labor Market: A Meta-Analysis." *Economics of Education Review* 19(2):149-58.
Heath, Anthony, Sin Yi Cheung and Great Britain. 2006. *Ethnic Penalties in the Labour Market: Employers and Discrimination*: CDS.
Heath, Anthony and Jean Martin. 2013. "Can Religious Affiliation Explain 'Ethnic'inequalities in the Labour Market?". *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(6):1005-27.
Hooks, Bell. 1981. *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*, Vol. 3: South End Press Boston.

Jeffrey Hill, E, Vjollca Märtinson and Maria Ferris. 2004. "New-Concept Part-Time Employment as a Work-Family Adaptive Strategy for Women Professionals with Small Children." *Family relations* 53(3):282-92.
Johnston, Ron, David Manley and Kelvyn Jones. 2016. "In Search of Britain's Muslim Ghettoes." *Environment and Planning A*:0308518X16651873.
Kain, John F. 1968. "Housing Segregation, Negro Employment, and Metropolitan Decentralization." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 82(165-97).
Kalter, Frank and Irena Kogan. 2006. "Ethnic Inequalities at the Transition from School to Work in Belgium and Spain: Discrimination or Self-Exclusion?". *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 24(3):259-74.
Koopmans, Ruud. 2016. "Does Assimilation Work? Sociocultural Determinants of Labour Market Participation of European Muslims." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42(2):197-216.
Lehrer, Evelyn L. 2004. "Religion as a Determinant of Economic and Demographic Behavior in the United States." *Population and Development Review* 30(4):707-26.
Lindley, Joanne, Angela Dale and Shirley Dex. 2004. "Ethnic Differences in Women's Demographic, Family Characteristics and Economic Activity Profiles, 1992 to 2002." *Labour Market Trends* 112(4):153-66.
Lindley, Joanne K, Angela Dale and Shirley Dex. 2006. "Ethnic Differences in Women's Employment: The Changing Role of Qualifications." *Oxford economic papers* 58(2):351-78.
Maxwell, Rahsaan. 2009. "Caribbean and South Asian Identification with British Society: The Importance of Perceived Discrimination." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32(8):1449-69.
McBride, Anne, Gail Hebson and Jane Holgate. 2015. "Intersectionality: Are We Taking Enough Notice in the Field of Work and Employment Relations?". *Work, employment & society* 29(2):331-41.
Meer, Nasar and Tariq Modood. 2009. "Refutations of Racism in the 'Muslim Question'." *Patterns of Prejudice* 43(3-4):335-54.
Model, Suzanne and Lang Lin. 2002. "The Cost of Not Being Christian: Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims in Britain and Canada." *International Migration Review* 36(4):1061-92.
Modood, Tariq. 2005. *Multicultural Politics: Racism, Ethnicity and Muslims in Britain*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Moosavi, Leon. 2015. "The Racialization of Muslim Converts in Britain and Their Experiences of Islamophobia." *Critical Sociology* 41(1):41-56.
Neckerman, Kathryn M and Joleen Kirschenman. 1991. "Hiring Strategies, Racial Bias, and Inner-City Workers." *Social Problems* 38(4):433-47.
Pager, Devah and Diana Karafin. 2009. "Bayesian Bigot? Statistical Discrimination, Stereotypes, and Employer Decision Making." *The annals of the American academy of political and social science* 621(1):70-93.
Peach, Ceri. 2005. "Britain's Muslim Population: An Overview." Pp. 18-30 in *Muslim Britain: Communities under Pressure*, edited by T. Abbas. London: ZED Books.
Peach, Ceri. 2006a. "South Asian Migration and Settlement in Great Britain, 1951–2001." *Contemporary South Asia* 15(2):133-46.
Peach, Ceri. 2006b. "Muslims in the 2001 Census of England and Wales: Gender and Economic Disadvantage." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29(4):629-55.
Rana, Junaid. 2007. "The Story of Islamophobia." *Souls* 9(2):148-61.

Read, Jen'nan Ghazal. 2004. "Cultural Influences on Immigrant Women's Labor Force Participation: The Arab-American Case1." *International Migration Review* 38(1):52-77.
Reskin, Barbara F, Debra B McBrier and Julie A Kmec. 1999. "The Determinants and Consequences of Workplace Sex and Race Composition." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:335-61.
Reskin, Barbara F. 2001. "Labor Markets as Queues: A Structural Approach to Changing Occupational Sex Composition." *American Sociological Review* 52(2):195-210.
Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 1997. "Interaction and the Conservation of Gender Inequality: Considering Employment." *American Sociological Review*:218-35.
Spierings, Niels. 2014. "How Islam Influences Women's Paid Non-Farm Employment: Evidence from 26 Indonesian and 37 Nigerian Provinces." *Review of Religious Research* 56(3):399-431.
Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald, Catherine Zimmer, Kevin Stainback, Corre Robinson, Tiffany Taylor and Tricia McTague. 2006. "Documenting Desegregation: Segregation in American Workplaces by Race, Ethnicity, and Sex, 1966–2003." *American Sociological Review* 71(4):565-88.
Tyrer, David and Fauzia Ahmad. 2006. "Muslim Women and Higher Education: Identities, Experiences and Prospects." *A Summary Report, Liverpool John Moores University and European Social Fund, Liverpool*.
Van Tubergen, Frank, Ineke Maas and Henk Flap. 2004. "The Economic Incorporation of Immigrants in 18 Western Societies: Origin, Destination, and Community Effects." *American Sociological Review* 69(5):704-27.

Table 1: Summary statistics for the dependent variables by ethno-religious background (proportions)

	Christian White-British	Christian White Irish	Christian Indian	Christian Black African	Christian Black Carib	Christian Arab	Hindu Indian	Muslim White-British	Muslim Indian	Muslim Pakistani	Muslim Bangladeshi	Muslim Black-African	Muslim Arab	Sikh Indian	No religion White-British	All Christian	All Muslim
Unemployed	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.13	0.1	0.1	0.08	0.14	0.11	0.17	0.2	0.3	0.22	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.19
N	**324,231**	**4,905**	**1,779**	**8,103**	**6,310**	**136**	**7,515**	**558**	**1,478**	**5,337**	**2,023**	**1,253**	**673**	**3,774**	**137,990**	**345,464**	**11,322**
Out of employment History																	
Up to 1 year	0.44	0.43	0.38	0.33	0.40	0.43	0.45	0.26	0.32	0.24	0.16	0.20	0.21	0.40	0.40	0.43	0.22
2 to 5 years	0.25	0.23	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.21	0.24	0.22	0.24	0.19	0.20	0.18	0.17	0.29	0.26	0.26	0.19
6 to 11 years	0.19	0.26	0.10	0.13	0.17	0.14	0.10	0.24	0.15	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.15	0.18	0.18	0.13
never worked	0.12	0.08	0.23	0.25	0.15	0.21	0.21	0.28	0.29	0.46	0.52	0.49	0.49	0.16	0.16	0.13	0.46
N	**13,823**	**202**	**87**	**1,050**	**625**	**14**	**568**	**76**	**168**	**922**	**402**	**380**	**150**	**240**	**9,801**	**15,801**	**2,098**
Part-time employment	0.44	0.34	0.23	0.33	0.33	0.39	0.32	0.49	0.51	0.51	0.53	0.51	0.47	0.36	0.4	0.44	0.51
N	**310,408**	**4,703**	**1,692**	**7,053**	**5,685**	**122**	**6,947**	**482**	**1,310**	**4,415**	**1,621**	**873**	**523**	**3,534**	**128,189**	**329,663**	**9,224**
Over Qualification																	
Severe Underqualified	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02
Moderate Underqualified	0.25	0.19	0.09	0.11	0.22	0.1	0.14	0.24	0.2	0.22	0.24	0.27	0.14	0.2	0.23	0.24	0.22
Match	0.43	0.53	0.64	0.47	0.43	0.52	0.5	0.41	0.47	0.41	0.38	0.39	0.47	0.44	0.43	0.44	0.41
Moderate Overqualified	0.28	0.25	0.23	0.36	0.31	0.3	0.29	0.3	0.26	0.3	0.3	0.26	0.31	0.31	0.3	0.28	0.29
Severe Overqualified	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.07	0.07	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.05
N	**312,831**	**4,538**	**1,580**	**7,392**	**6,016**	**119**	**6,662**	**521**	**1,318**	**4,807**	**1,825**	**1,065**	**536**	**3,311**	**134,296**	**332,476**	**10,072**
Occupational class																	
Higher/lower managerial and professional	0.39	0.56	0.63	0.45	0.45	0.48	0.46	0.37	0.38	0.35	0.34	0.28	0.49	0.38	0.41	0.40	0.35
Other classes	0.61	0.44	0.37	0.55	0.56	0.52	0.54	0.63	0.62	0.65	0.66	0.72	0.51	0.63	0.59	0.60	0.65
N	**310,869**	**4,729**	**1,691**	**7,157**	**5,783**	**127**	**7,120**	**493**	**1,345**	**4,567**	**1,656**	**927**	**545**	**3,575**	**129,783**	**330,356**	**9,533**

Source: Authors' elaboration on UK Census 2011. Note: Sample includes women aged 16-64 in labor force. We excluded from the sample Jewish women.

Table 2: Summary statistics for the independent variables by ethno-religious background (proportions)

	Christian White-British	Christian White Irish	Christian Indian	Christian Black African	Christian Black Carib	Christian Arab	Hindu Indian	Muslim White-British	Muslim Indian	Muslim Pakistani	Muslim Bangladeshi	Muslim Black-African	Muslim Arab	Sikh Indian	No religion White-British	All Christian	All Muslim
Family Dependent Children																	
One	0.09	0.09	0.19	0.17	0.16	0.12	0.14	0.17	0.13	0.13	0.15	0.16	0.12	0.11	0.14	0.09	0.14
Two	0.11	0.1	0.25	0.18	0.12	0.14	0.13	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.16	0.16	0.19	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.15
Three or More	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.15	0.07	0.06	0.03	0.1	0.1	0.15	0.18	0.23	0.17	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.16
No Dependent children under 10	0.22	0.2	0.18	0.23	0.28	0.19	0.18	0.21	0.21	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.2	0.23	0.2	0.22	0.23
No Dependent Children at All	0.54	0.56	0.31	0.27	0.39	0.5	0.53	0.37	0.41	0.35	0.29	0.23	0.33	0.48	0.48	0.53	0.33
N	**284,343**	**3,782**	**1,508**	**6,323**	**4,819**	**108**	**6,677**	**469**	**1,327**	**4,815**	**1,828**	**997**	**579**	**3,422**	**115,436**	**300,883**	**10,015**
Marital Status																	
Single	0.29	0.35	0.16	0.33	0.52	0.37	0.21	0.29	0.25	0.27	0.31	0.31	0.24	0.22	0.49	0.29	0.28
Divorced, separated	0.18	0.15	0.08	0.22	0.19	0.1	0.08	0.19	0.11	0.15	0.12	0.29	0.18	0.12	0.16	0.18	0.16
Married	0.54	0.5	0.76	0.46	0.29	0.54	0.71	0.52	0.64	0.58	0.57	0.4	0.58	0.66	0.36	0.53	0.56
N	**323,597**	**4,889**	**1,779**	**8,095**	**6,308**	**136**	**7,511**	**558**	**1,475**	**5,334**	**2,021**	**1,252**	**673**	**3,771**	**137,409**	**344,804**	**11,313**
Length of Time Since Migration																	
0-4 Years	0	0.07	0.15	0.12	0.02	0.15	0.12	0.02	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.14	0.19	0.03	0	0.01	0.08
5-10 Years	0	0.08	0.46	0.31	0.06	0.21	0.15	0.04	0.11	0.09	0.09	0.36	0.19	0.07	0	0.01	0.12
11+ Years	0.02	0.49	0.25	0.43	0.32	0.51	0.43	0.14	0.34	0.31	0.43	0.44	0.46	0.35	0.02	0.04	0.35
UK born	0.98	0.37	0.14	0.14	0.6	0.13	0.29	0.8	0.48	0.54	0.42	0.06	0.16	0.55	0.97	0.94	0.45
N	**324,231**	**4,905**	**1,779**	**8,103**	**6,310**	**136**	**7,515**	**558**	**1,478**	**5,337**	**2,023**	**1,253**	**673**	**3,774**	**137,990**	**345,464**	**11,322**
Region																	
North	0.32	0.17	0.16	0.1	0.07	0.13	0.1	0.25	0.33	0.37	0.16	0.1	0.18	0.08	0.24	0.30	0.28
Midlands	0.19	0.14	0.15	0.09	0.18	0.06	0.23	0.15	0.26	0.23	0.14	0.12	0.1	0.41	0.18	0.19	0.19
East	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.02	0.05	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.05
South	0.26	0.2	0.24	0.12	0.08	0.14	0.12	0.17	0.06	0.11	0.08	0.11	0.11	0.16	0.29	0.25	0.10
Wales	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.07	0.05	0.02

London inner and outer	0.08	0.36	0.3	0.59	0.61	0.59	0.47	0.34	0.3	0.23	0.53	0.63	0.54	0.3	0.1	0.10	0.36
N	**324,231**	**4,905**	**1,779**	**8,103**	**6,310**	**136**	**7,515**	**558**	**1,478**	**5,337**	**2,023**	**1,253**	**673**	**3,774**	**137,990**	**345,464**	**11,322**
Highest Qualification																	
No qualification	0.1	0.09	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.13	0.11	0.13	0.13	0.27	0.1	0.12	0.09	0.10	0.14
Level 1	0.18	0.1	0.07	0.1	0.16	0.07	0.11	0.18	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.09	0.15	0.17	0.17	0.15
Level 2	0.22	0.13	0.08	0.14	0.19	0.09	0.09	0.18	0.14	0.14	0.17	0.15	0.11	0.14	0.2	0.21	0.15
Level 3 A-Level	0.16	0.13	0.07	0.11	0.16	0.07	0.08	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.17	0.09	0.09	0.11	0.16	0.16	0.14
Degree	0.35	0.55	0.74	0.61	0.42	0.71	0.64	0.38	0.44	0.43	0.38	0.33	0.61	0.48	0.37	0.36	0.42
N	**312,831**	**4,538**	**1,580**	**7,392**	**6,016**	**119**	**6,662**	**521**	**1,318**	**4,807**	**1,825**	**1,065**	**536**	**3,311**	**134,296**	**332,476**	**10,072**
Main language English	1	0.99	0.6	0.75	0.99	0.5	0.62	0.86	0.64	0.66	0.54	0.43	0.42	0.72	1	0.99	0.61
N	**324,231**	**4,905**	**1,779**	**8,103**	**6,310**	**136**	**7,515**	**558**	**1,478**	**5,337**	**2,023**	**1,253**	**673**	**3,774**	**137,990**	**345,464**	**11,322**
Age (Average)	43	44	38	39	42	38	39	37	36	34	31	36	36	39	37	40.65	34.91
N	**324,231**	**4,905**	**1,779**	**8,103**	**6,310**	**136**	**7,515**	**558**	**1,478**	**5,337**	**2,023**	**1,253**	**673**	**3,774**	**137,990**	**345,464**	**11,322**

Source: Authors' elaboration on UK Census 2011. Note: Sample includes women aged 16-64 in labor force. We excluded from the sample Jewish women.

Table 3: Logit models for the ethno-religious differences in the dependent variables

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Logit Model			**Order Logit Model**	**Multinomial Logit (Reference: Match)**	
	Unemployed	Part time employees	Managerial Jobs	Out of employment history	Moderate Overqualified	Severe Overqualified
Ethnicity (Reference Group: Christian White-British)						
Christian White Irish	0.15	-0.17***	0.28***	0.03	-0.21***	-0.28**
	(0.092)	(0.040)	(0.041)	(0.141)	(0.043)	(0.134)
Christian Indian	0.29**	-1.03***	0.57***	0.51**	-0.60***	-0.30*
	(0.142)	(0.077)	(0.070)	(0.250)	(0.072)	(0.174)
Christian Black African	0.91***	-0.44***	-0.29***	0.16*	0.27***	0.67***
	(0.058)	(0.039)	(0.037)	(0.094)	(0.036)	(0.079)
Christian Black Caribbean	0.69***	-0.38***	-0.06	-0.12	0.16***	0.25**
	(0.057)	(0.038)	(0.039)	(0.097)	(0.037)	(0.099)
Christian Arab^	0.60	--^	-0.51**	0.30	0.05	0.95**
	(0.424)	(0.252)	(0.226)	(0.859)	(0.240)	(0.402)
Hindu Indian	0.68***	-0.30***	-0.19***	0.00	-0.05	0.86***
	(0.060)	(0.037)	(0.035)	(0.120)	(0.035)	(0.066)
Muslim White-British	0.81***	0.11	-0.26**	0.54**	0.08	0.30
	(0.157)	(0.114)	(0.124)	(0.250)	(0.116)	(0.299)
Muslim Indian	0.70***	0.38***	-0.13*	0.46**	-0.19***	0.51***
	(0.105)	(0.072)	(0.074)	(0.179)	(0.073)	(0.149)
Muslim Pakistani	1.07***	0.28***	-0.26***	1.00***	0.02	0.84***
	(0.050)	(0.041)	(0.042)	(0.093)	(0.039)	(0.076)
Muslim Bangladeshi	1.01***	0.33***	-0.19***	0.99***	0.06	0.82***
	(0.075)	(0.068)	(0.072)	(0.134)	(0.064)	(0.123)

Muslim Black-African	1.36***	0.13	-0.32***	0.54***	0.04	0.82***
	(0.096)	(0.099)	(0.110)	(0.159)	(0.092)	(0.164)
Muslim Arab	1.44***	0.19	0.04	0.92***	0.06	0.80***
	(0.143)	(0.127)	(0.125)	(0.241)	(0.112)	(0.197)
Sikh Indian	0.32***	-0.33***	-0.25***	0.06	0.07	0.78***
	(0.083)	(0.046)	(0.046)	(0.145)	(0.045)	(0.092)
No religion White-British	0.25***	-0.01	0.03***	-0.01	-0.02***	0.07***
	(0.016)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.028)	(0.009)	(0.025)
Family Dependent Children (Reference Group: One)						
Two	0.16***	0.62***	-0.21***	0.32***	0.01	0.16***
	(0.027)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.041)	(0.015)	(0.045)
Three or More	0.51***	0.78***	-0.43***	0.65***	0.00	0.22***
	(0.031)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.046)	(0.020)	(0.057)
No Dependent children under 10	-0.03	-0.38***	-0.28***	0.28***	0.09***	0.23***
	(0.024)	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.042)	(0.014)	(0.041)
No Dependent Children at All	-0.50***	-1.40***	0.06***	-0.46***	0.08***	0.28***
	(0.023)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.041)	(0.013)	(0.037)
Marital Status (Reference Group: Single)						
Divorced, separated	0.01	-0.08***	0.09***	-0.05	-0.02	-0.17***
	(0.025)	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.035)	(0.014)	(0.040)
Married	-0.79***	0.18***	0.18***	-0.42***	-0.13***	-0.40***
	(0.021)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.033)	(0.011)	(0.030)
Length of Time Since Migration (Reference Group: 0-4 Years)						
5-10 Years	-1.00***	-0.33***	0.41***	-0.41***	-0.27***	-0.64***
	(0.080)	(0.068)	(0.063)	(0.139)	(0.058)	(0.093)
11+ Years	-1.14***	-0.17***	0.44***	-0.51***	-0.11**	-1.06***
	(0.071)	(0.062)	(0.057)	(0.122)	(0.053)	(0.085)
UK born	-1.24***	-0.05	0.46***	-0.62***	-0.12**	-1.02***
	(0.072)	(0.062)	(0.057)	(0.125)	(0.053)	(0.086)
Region (Reference Group: North)						
Midlands	-0.08***	0.03**	-0.00	0.03	0.01	-0.02
	(0.020)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.036)	(0.011)	(0.032)
East	-0.18***	0.09***	0.08***	-0.09**	-0.04***	-0.09**
	(0.026)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.045)	(0.014)	(0.040)
South	-0.24***	0.10***	0.06***	-0.15***	0.02**	0.06**
	(0.020)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.036)	(0.010)	(0.029)
Wales	-0.11***	-0.00	-0.08***	0.03	-0.03*	0.11**
	(0.032)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.060)	(0.017)	(0.047)
London inner and outer	0.00	-0.20***	0.27***	0.23***	-0.15***	-0.07*
	(0.026)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.045)	(0.015)	(0.037)
Main Language English	-0.19***	-0.18***	0.34***	-0.56***	-0.00	-0.35***

		(0.047)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.083)	(0.034)	(0.062)
Age		-0.13***	-0.11***	0.16***	-0.10***	-0.06***	-0.09***
		(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.009)	(0.002)	(0.006)
Age Square		0.00***	0.00***	-0.00***	0.00***	0.00***	0.00***
		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Qualification (Reference Group: No Qualification)							
Level 1		-0.67***	-0.36***	0.74***	-0.62***		
		(0.022)	(0.014)	(0.020)	(0.036)		
Level 2		-1.03***	-0.54***	1.02***	-1.01***		
		(0.023)	(0.014)	(0.020)	(0.038)		
Level 3 A-Level		-1.56***	-0.77***	1.44***	-1.20***		
		(0.027)	(0.015)	(0.020)	(0.047)		
Degree		-1.77***	-1.22***	3.12***	-1.36***		
		(0.025)	(0.014)	(0.019)	(0.042)		
Constant cut1					-4.30***		
					(0.209)		
Constant cut2					-3.15***		
					(0.209)		
Constant cut3					-2.04***		
					(0.210)		
Constant		3.06***	2.65***	-6.28***		1.14***	0.16
		(0.109)	(0.082)	(0.083)		(0.073)	(0.145)
	Wald chi2	17,788.02	51,807.47	86,517.93	3,441.43	17,630.96	
	Prob > chi2	0	0	0	0	0	
	Pseudo R2	0.1242	0.1155	0.2041	0.0634	0.0172	
	Obs.	418,727	395,945	397,929	22,782	418,727	418,727

Source: Authors' elaboration on UK Census 2011. Note: Sample includes women aged 16-64 in labor force.

^ the number of respondents among Christian Arab women was very low (N=14) in relation to unemployment history.

Table 4: Logit models for the impact of ethnicity and religion on the dependent variables

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Logit Model			**Order Logit Model**	**Multinomial Logit (Reference: Match)**	
	Unemployed	Part time employees	Managerial Jobs	Out of employment history	Moderate Overqualified	Severe Overqualified
Ethnicity (Reference Group: White British)						
White Irish	-0.01	-0.15***	0.27***	0.04	-0.19***	-0.21*
	(0.086)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.130)	(0.040)	(0.116)
Indians	0.45***	-0.29***	-0.13***	0.12	-0.09***	0.65***
	(0.044)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.081)	(0.025)	(0.052)
Pakistanis	0.96***	0.24***	-0.27***	0.97***	0.02	0.80***
	(0.047)	(0.039)	(0.040)	(0.087)	(0.037)	(0.071)
Bangladeshis	0.88***	0.33***	-0.22***	0.88***	0.09	0.83***
	(0.071)	(0.064)	(0.068)	(0.128)	(0.061)	(0.114)
Black-Africans	0.86***	-0.33***	-0.34***	0.20**	0.27***	0.68***
	(0.051)	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.084)	(0.033)	(0.072)
Black-Caribbean	0.62***	-0.33***	-0.09***	0.02	0.15***	0.26***
	(0.050)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.083)	(0.033)	(0.087)
Arabs	1.15***	0.10	-0.03	0.92***	0.04	0.88***
	(0.125)	(0.103)	(0.102)	(0.219)	(0.094)	(0.159)
Religion (Reference Group: Christian)						
No religion	0.23***	0.01	0.05***	0.00	-0.03***	-0.01
	(0.015)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.026)	(0.008)	(0.023)
Hindu	0.57***	-0.08**	-0.16***	0.31***	-0.08***	0.52***
	(0.050)	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.095)	(0.029)	(0.053)

Muslim	0.99***	0.40***	-0.17***	0.94***	-0.02	0.40***
	(0.031)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.057)	(0.025)	(0.050)
Sikh	0.34***	-0.24***	-0.23***	0.12	0.04	0.52***
	(0.069)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.120)	(0.039)	(0.080)

Source: Authors' elaboration on UK Census 2011. Note: Sample includes women aged 16-64 in labour force

Table 5: Logit models for the impact of qualifications, language and length of stay since migration on the dependent variables (Muslims only)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Logit Model			**Order Logit Model**
	Unemployed	Part time employees	Managerial Jobs	Out of employment history
Length of Time Since Migration (Reference Group: 0-4 Years)				
5-10 Years	-0.26*	-0.01	-0.41*	-0.45*
	(0.143)	(0.174)	(0.224)	(0.264)
11+ Years	-0.49***	-0.07	-0.05	-0.51**
	(0.133)	(0.158)	(0.193)	(0.245)
UK born	-0.75***	-0.27*	0.13	-0.83***
	(0.138)	(0.162)	(0.198)	(0.251)
Main Language English	-0.50***	-0.25***	0.43***	-0.53***
	(0.071)	(0.072)	(0.090)	(0.119)
Qualification (Reference Group: Other)				
Degree	-0.39**	-0.79***	1.68***	-1.33***
	(0.181)	(0.196)	(0.219)	(0.325)
Academic Degree interacted Main Language English	-0.01	0.03	-0.05	0.04
	(0.136)	(0.109)	(0.119)	(0.217)
Academic Degree interacted Length of Time Since Migration (Reference Group: 0-4 Years)				
5-10 Years	-0.35	-0.21	0.45*	0.59
	(0.228)	(0.233)	(0.267)	(0.402)
11+ Years	-0.47**	-0.17	0.35	0.65*
	(0.209)	(0.210)	(0.233)	(0.352)
UK born	-0.44**	-0.02	0.20	0.49
	(0.219)	(0.216)	(0.240)	(0.378)

Source: Authors' elaboration on UK Census 2011. Note: Sample includes only Muslim women aged 16-64 in labour force.

[i] In the final model, we have analysed all of the sample including those who were underqualified. Because we only interested in overqualification as a form of labour market penalties, we do not report the results for the underqualification. These results can be made available upon request.